

1608/3309

THE  
C A S E  
OF THE  
EPISCOPAL DISSENTERS  
IN  
SCOTLAND,  
And that of the  
Dissenters in *Ireland*  
COMPAR'D;  
With Relation to *Toleration* and a Capa-  
city for CIVIL OFFICES.  
IN A  
LETTER  
TO A  
Member of Parliament.

---

DUBLIN:  
Printed by S. POWELL in *Crane-lane*, and Sold  
by the Booksellers. MDCCLXXXIII.

THE  
C A S E  
OF THE  
BINGO



SCOTT AND  
Associates in  
CONRAD  
and  
of the District of Columbia

LETTER  
TO  
THE  
HONORABLE  
MEMBERS OF THE  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
IN CONGRESS ASSEMBLED  
AT THE CITY OF WASHINGTON  
JANUARY 1867

S I R,

**T**HERE is nothing that has been more frequently objected to the Protestant Dissenters here than the Usage the Presbyterians in *Scotland* are suppos'd to have given to the Episcopal Dissenters in that Kingdom. This has been hinted at in several Papers lately publish'd, particularly in one that came out a few Days ago with this Title, *The Tables turn'd against the Presbyterians, or Reasons against the Sacramental Test, by a General Assembly of Scotland*. The Author of that Paper produces a Representation of the General Assembly in 1703, against tolerating those of the Episcopal Persuasion there, and seems to think this a very good Reason why the Dissenters here shou'd not be render'd capable of Places of Profit and Trust.

I shall give you my Thoughts on this Subject, and hope to shew,

*First*, That supposing the Account this Writer gives of the Representation of the General Assembly to be intirely true and just, it does not at all affect the Dissenters of this Kingdom, nor ought to be turn'd to their Prejudice.

*2dly*, I shall state the Matter of Fact itself, by which it will appear that the Presbyterian Church of *Scotland* is not such an Enemy to Toleration as some People wou'd make us believe, and that the Dissenters in this Kingdom desire no better Treatment than is given to the Episcopal Dissenters there.

As to the First, I know no Reason in the World, why the Dissenters here shou'd be made answerable for any thing that is said or done by the General Assembly of *Scotland*. It is very hard, that when their Enemies

can find nothing in their Conduct here to charge them with, they must go to another Kingdom to find Matter of Accusation. Is it because the Church of *Scotland* and the Dissenters here are *Presbyterians*, or, as this Writer calls them, *Brethren*? and must the Dissenters in *Ireland* be accountable for every Thing that has at any Time been done by any under the Denomination of *Presbyterians*? must the Church of *England* be charg'd with all the wrong Things done by those of the Episcopal Persuasion every where? and particularly with all the ill Things that have been done (of which many might be easily mention'd) by those of the Episcopal Persuasion in *Scotland*? I am perswaded this wou'd be thought very unfair in the one Case, and why shou'd it be thought fair or just in the other? The Dissenters in *Ireland* don't think themselves any further concluded by what passes in the General Assembly of the Church of *Scotland*, than as they apprehend it to be agreeable to Scripture, or right Reason. If therefore that General Assembly had expressly declar'd against all Toleration of any Profession but their own, this ought not to be a Prejudice to the Protestant Dissenters in *Ireland*, who if they may be allow'd to know their own Sentiments, and I think they are rather to be believ'd in this than their bitter Adversaries, are as generally for tolerating all Protestants that differ from them, as any Body of Men now in the World.

But I am willing, that I may allow these Gentlemen all the Scope they can desire, to carry the Supposition yet further. Let us suppose, that once upon a time the Dissenters in *Ireland* had drawn up a Representation against tolerating those of the Episcopal Persuasion here, this no doubt wou'd have been made use of as an unquestionable Proof that the Dissenters here are not fit be tolerated, much less intrusted by the Government. And yet on this Supposition,





position, it wou'd not be a fair Inference. For why shou'd the present Generation of Dissenters be answerable for every wrong Thing that was done by any of that Denomination in former Ages in this Kingdom, except it can be prov'd (which I am sure it cannot) to be one of their known avowed Principles. They desire in this Case no other Allowance to be made to them, than what the Gentlemen of the establish'd Church wou'd think it just to claim to themselves. The Revd. Mr. *Story* tells us in his late *Sermon* preach'd before the Honourable House of Commons, that all Churches *Lutheran* and *Calvinist*, *Churchman* and *Dissenter*, have been too prone in their Turns to lay Hardships on those that differ'd from them. Does this prove that therefore none of them ought to be tolerated at all? no; but that they shou'd all grow wiser, and endeavour to throw off all the unhappy Remains of a Spirit of Persecution, and act in a Manner more becoming the mild and charitable Temper and Genius of the Gospel.

If I were dispos'd to revive Things which had better be forgotten, it wou'd be no hard Matter to mention *Canons and Constitutions Ecclesiastical*, drawn up by a famous Convocation of the Church of *England* in 1603, excommunicating, *ipso facto*, all that dissent from her, and thereby subjecting them to the severest Penalties; and if the present Church of *England* be not accountable for any Principles or Canons that any of its Convocations have formerly advanc'd inconsistent with Toleration, much less are the Dissenters in *Ireland* accountable for any Thing that pass'd in a General Assembly of the Church of *Scotland*, even tho' it had been Canons ratified with the greatest Solemnity, whereas the Thing here objected is only a Petition or Address of the Commission of the General Assembly, which carries far less of Authority in it than the other. I have

I have gone hitherto on the Supposition that the General Assembly of the Church of *Scotland* was as great an Enemy to a Toleration of those that dissent from her, as some are willing to believe, but I am of Opinion, that upon a fair and impartial stating the Fact, it will appear, that that Church has shew'd a moderation towards those of the Episcopal Persuasion, that perhaps considering all things cannot be easily parallel'd in other Churches; I am sure incomparably more than the Episcopal Church there had shewn to them.

Whoever considers the Hardships that were put upon the Presbyterians in *Scotland*, between the Time of the Restoration and the Revolution, and the cruel Laws that were enacted against them, whereby they were pursued to Fining, Imprisonment, Confiscation, Banishment, and Death, might be ready to expect that when the Presbyterians came to have the Power in their own Hands, they shou'd have been exasperated to the highest Degree, and have retaliated their own Severities upon them. But whether they did this or not, will appear to any Man that impartially considers the following Account.

The first Act that cou'd affect the Episcopal Clergy was that of the Convention, *April 13. 1689*, whereby all were requir'd to *pray for King William and Queen Mary, and to read the Proclamation in their Churches, and that the Refusers should be depriv'd of their Churches and Benefices, and that they who obey'd shou'd be protected.* In Consequence of this, many were ejected for refusing to pray for the King and Queen, or to read the Proclamation; but I suppose this will not be charg'd as Persecution in the Church of *Scotland*, any more than depriving the Non-jurors in *England*, will be brought as a Charge of Persecution against the Church of *England*. We see by this very Act, that the Episcopal Clergy were  
to

to be protected in their Churches and Benefices, if they pray'd for their Majesties, and by an Act of the same Convention it is prohibited and discharg'd that any Injury be offer'd by any Person whatsoever to any Minister of the Gospel either in Church or Meeting-Houses, who are presently in the Possession and Exercise of their Ministry therein, and behave as becomes under the present Government.

In the first Parliament after the Revolution, there was an Act pass'd June the 7th 1690, establishing Presbyterian Church-Government, in which it is ordain'd, that the General Assembly, the Ministers and Elders shall have power to try and purge out all insufficient, scandalous, and erroneous Ministers, by due Course of Ecclesiastical Process and Censures. By this Act they were not to eject any Ministers except they were insufficient, scandalous, or erroneous. But it will perhaps be said they judg'd the Ministers of the Episcopal Persuasion to be erroneous, and therefore wou'd eject them meerly on that Account. But the contrary appears from a Declaration of the General Assembly that sat from October the 16th to November the 19th in that same Year 1690, (and which was the first General Assembly after the Revolution) which came to this Resolution, Session the 6th, that *this Assembly will depose no Incumbent simply for their Judgment anment the Government of the Church, nor urge Reordination upon them. And that same Assembly gave Instructions to their Committee for Visitations, That they be very cautious of receiving Informations against the late Conformists, and that they proceed in the Matter of Censure very deliberately, that none may have just Cause to complain of their Rigidity, and that they shall not proceed to Censure, but upon relevant Libels, and sufficient Probation: And the Committee is further impower'd, if they shall be inform'd of any precipitant Procedure of the Presbyteries in such Processes to restrain them.* After

After this, by an Act of Parliament pass'd *July* the 16th 1695, no more is requir'd of Persons in order to their continuance in their respective *Kirks, Benefices, and Stipends*, than that they take the *Oath of Allegiance and the Assurance*; and behave themselves worthily in *Doctrine, Life, and Conversation*. By the Assurance is meant a Declaration, that they account King *William* a rightful King, and not an Usurper, and that they swear Fidelity to him as King in that Sense.

Upon these terms were the Episcopal Incumbents allow'd to continue in their Churches. And whereas many of them had continu'd in their Places till that time without taking the Oaths, and therefore according to several Acts of Parliament that had been made shou'd have been ejected and depriv'd, they were allow'd further time to come and qualify themselves till the 1st of *September* in that Year 1695. And afterwards in the Years 1702 and 1703, those that wou'd still come in and qualify were allow'd the Benefit of it. And so great was the Moderation exercised towards them, that so lately as in the Year 1710 there was publish'd a List of 112 Episcopal Ministers who then enjoy'd Churches and Mansion-Houses in *Scotland*, several of whom were profess'd Non-jurors, and refus'd to pray for the Queen; besides a great Number of others that preach'd in Meeting-Houses, where some of them pray'd for the Pretender, and others refus'd to pray for the Queen, and pray'd only for their Sovereign, meaning the Pretender.

I know the Episcopal Clergy of *Scotland* have rais'd very great Clamours of unparallel'd Hardships and sufferings, (and I doubt not the Non-jurors in *England* think their own Sufferings as grievous) but they have been frequently challeng'd to name any one Clergyman of the Episcopal Persuasion that was turn'd out of his Parish after *April* the 13th, 1689, when the Government was settled after the In-



terregnum, for any other Cause than their Immorality and Insufficiency (for which they wou'd have been equally ejected if they had been Presbyterians) or for not taking the Oaths to the Government: Concerning which you may see the Vindication of the Church of *Scotland* in answer to five Pamphlets, publish'd by order of the General Assembly in 1691.

After King *William's* Death and Queen *Anne's* Accession to the Throne, the Jacobites took heart, and began to conceive great hopes of some new turn of Affairs in their favour, particularly in *Scotland*. Many came over from *St. Germain's* and other Parts of *France* to *Scotland*, that had forfeited their Lives to the Law by practising against the Government in King *William's* Reign. And the Episcopal Clergy mov'd for an Indulgence by an Address to her Majesty; which Address (as one of their Agents Mr. *Richard Scott* expresses it in a Letter dated *January the 11th 1703*) was very well drawn by the Advice both of Churchmen and Lawyers, without any Promise of qualifying. In that Address they desire her Majesty to give liberty to such Parishes, where all or most of the Heretors and Inhabitants are of the Episcopal Persuasion, to call, place, and give Benefices to Ministers of their own Principles. Here it is plain, that their Design in petitioning for an Indulgence was not meerly for a freedom of Worship in their own way in separate Meetings, but to get the publick Churches and Benefices into their own hands, and dispossess the present Incumbents, wherever they had the Majority in a Parish, and all this, without qualifying themselves by taking the Oaths to the Government; and I leave it to you, Sir, to judge, what would have been thought of the Dissenters of this Kingdom, notwithstanding their known loyalty, if ever they had presumed to make such a Proposal.



And now this may let us into the design of the Motion that was made in Parliament, that same Year, *June* the 7th, 1703, for granting them a Toleration, against which the Commission of the General Assembly made the Representation that has been so much exclaim'd against. It must be observ'd, that the Draught of the Bill for Toleration brought into Parliament, had not the least Clause obliging the Preachers to swear to her Majesty, or to pray for her; and it concluded with a Clause whereby all former Acts of Parliament that seem'd to derogate from the Toleration then propos'd, shou'd be made of no Force, which was plainly calculated to take off the Force of those Acts that oblig'd all Preachers to take the Oaths, and pray for her Majesty. Accordingly the Parliament refus'd to grant this Toleration, because they saw plainly, that under the Notion of that Indulgence, the Faction had a Design not only to set up Meeting-Houses but to obtrude Preachers upon Churches, where without taking the Oaths to the civil Government, they might train up People in Disaffection to it, and make way for the Pretender. You may see a very good Account of this whole Matter in a Book printed in 1704. called, *An Account of the Proceedings of the Parliament of Scotland, which met at Edinburgh, May 6. 1703.* As also, in the *Remarks on Mr. Griensfield's Case*, Publish'd by the Commission of the General Assembly in 1710. where we are further inform'd, that tho' the Party did not obtain the indulgence they demanded, yet many of them who were known Jacobites set up Meeting-Houses contrary to Law, and intruded into the Parishes, not only of Presbyterians, but also into those of the Episcopal Ministers, who were allow'd to continue in their Churches and Benefices, upon their taking the Oaths to the Civil Government,  
and

( II )

and they treated those Episcopal Ministers, with as much Spite and Contempt, because they had taken the Oaths, as they did the profess'd Presbyterians.

Upon this View of the Case, it will not seem so strange, that the General Assembly shou'd then express such an averseness to the Toleration propos'd, considering what they apprehended to be the design of it; nor that they shou'd declare, as they do in that Representation, that to grant a Toleration to that Party in the present Circumstances of Church and State, must unavoidably shake the Foundation of the present happy Constitution. And it is on this Ground that they afterwards say, that in the present Case and Circumstances of this Church and Nation, to enact a Toleration for those of that Way, wou'd be to Establish Iniquity by a Law. This Writer produces only the latter Part of the Sentence, but drops those Expressions (*in the present Case and Circumstances of this Church, and Nation*) whereby it wou'd have appear'd, that it was neither because they look'd upon all Toleration of those of a different Persuasion, to be Establishing Iniquity by a Law, nor because there was something particularly iniquitous in the Constitution of an Episcopal Church, as this Writer pretends, but because in the Circumstances they were then in, they apprehended it wou'd be highly dangerous to the Church and State.

I cannot here but observe another instance of the dissingenuity in this Writer, or in the Author he copies from, when pretending to give a just Account of that Representation made in the Name of the General Assembly, one very material Clause is omitted, in which they say, *this Toleration wou'd propagate and cherish Disaffection to the Civil Government*; he cites the Words immediately preceding this

Claufe, and the Words immediately following, but thinks proper to omit this, how fairly and candidly the World will judge.

And whereas it is urg'd in that Representation, that the People in *Scotland*, had no scruple in their Conscience against joint-Communion with the legally-Establish'd Church, till by the practising of some Persons they have in some Places divided of late; this Gentleman is pleas'd to contradict them in this, and takes upon him to affirm, that those of the Episcopal way in *Scotland*, always had some pretence of Conscience against joint-Communion. But it happens that he is intirely mistaken in Matter of Fact. The Episcopal Gentlemen, except those that were Enemies to the Government, made no scruple at the Time when the Commission of the General Assembly made that Representation, of attending the Ministrations of the Presbyterian Ministers. And indeed the Form of Worship in the Presbyterian Church, was very much the same that it had been in the Episcopal Church of *Scotland*; there was no Liturgy, no Ceremonies impos'd on either Side; and as to Church-Government, it is observed in the Representation above-mention'd, that it was the constant and known Principle of the Ministers of the Prelatical Way in *Scotland*, that Difference of Opinion about Church-Government, is no sufficient Reason for Separation in Worship. And they themselves had in a Formula given into the General Assembly, in 1692. in the Name of the Body of the Episcopal Clergy in *Scotland*, offer'd to submit to Presbyterian Church-Government, as then Establish'd; which Formula you may see in the above-mention'd Account of the proceedings of the Parliament in *Scotland*, p. 98. nor was there any Declaration ever requir'd of them, which oblig'd them to renounce their Sentiments as to Episcopacy.

None

None of them were ever disturb'd or ejected merely on that account ; but all that took the Oaths to the Government and were of good Conversation were secur'd by Act of Parliament in the Possession of their Places and Benefices. These Things consider'd, it appears pretty plainly, that the Scruple of those of the Episcopal Way in *Scotland* against joint-Communion, was chiefly of the same Nature with that of the Nonjurors in *England* ; and great Industry was us'd to foment and widen the Division, on Purpose to keep up a Party against the State ; and I doubt not if there had been an Establish'd Episcopal Church continued in *Scotland*, that had fallen in with the Revolution, and present Government, the Body of the present Episcopal Dissenters wou'd have separated from them, as well as from the Presbyterians. It must be own'd indeed, that many of the Episcopal Party in *Scotland*, of late Years, are alter'd from what they were before, tho' not in their Aversion to the Government, which continues the same that ever it was. Several of them now make use of the English Liturgy, tho' it is well known that they are very much divided and have no small Contention among themselves on this Head ; and the Notions of those that nullify all the Presbyterian Ministrations, and unchurch all the Reformed Churches abroad, have also of late obtain'd among them ; which must necessarily drive them to a greater Distance from the Presbyterians than before.

I think upon the whole it appears that the Church of *Scotland* hath not been wanting in Moderation towards those of the Episcopal Persuasion ; and I believe it wou'd have been thought the highest Presumption, in the Dissenters in *England*, or here, to have expected any Benefice in the Church, upon such easy Terms as were allow'd to the  
the



the Episcopal Dissenters there. And this I will venture to say, that if the Body of the Dissenters in this Kingdom, were such known Enemies to the Civil Government, as the Episcopal Party in *Scotland*, they wou'd scarce have had the Face to have applied for a Toleration, much less for a Capacity of being admitted to Civil Offices, or if they had applied for either in these Circumstances, I am pretty confident it wou'd have been rejected.

I need say no more to shew how much this Writer is mistaken, when he wou'd conclude from that Representation, made by the Commission of the General Assembly of *Scotland*, that the Dissenters in this Kingdom are Enemies to all Toleration, and ought not to be employ'd or intrusted by the Government. He observes indeed, that *whoever thinks joint-Communion with the Establish'd Church Lawful, may be an occasional Conformist, and consequently, may take an Employment when he can get it.* But I must own, the bitter reproaches that have been so often cast by those of this Writer's Spirit, against such as have occasionally conform'd, representing them as the basest of Hypocrites, give no great Encouragement to those who might be otherwise able to do it without Scruple. He adds, that *none are excluded but they who think Communion with an Episcopal Church iniquity.* I find this insisted on by the Author of a Pamphlet falsely ascrib'd to the Bishop of London, and lately reprinted here, the design of which is to shew, that *no Time is a proper Time for applying for the Repeal of the Test Act*; that Author affirms, that the Test Act only *excludes those who judging the Communion of the Church unlawful, as in it self sinful, are oblig'd in Conscience to destroy it as soon as they can.* This is twice or thrice repeated in that short Pamphlet, as if the stress of the Cause lay upon it. Yet the Supposition here made, is far from being true.



true. A Man may think Communion with the Establish'd Church very lawful, and yet be as much excluded by the Test Act, as if he judg'd it absolutely unlawful; because he may think it unlawful to take the Sacrament, as a qualification for a Civil Post; at least he cannot in Conscience do it himself, tho' he may not take upon him to condemn those that do so; and such a one is as effectually excluded by the Test Act, as if he thought it absolutely unlawful to have Communion with the Church at all.

Besides a Man may as to his own Practice, scruple Communion with the Establish'd Church, and yet not think himself oblig'd in Conscience to destroy it. He may have a very good Opinion of a Church, and very kind and charitable Thoughts of the Members of it, and yet not be able to hold Communion with that Church, if she requires any Thing as a Term of Communion which he scruples; and he may desire in such a Case to be indulg'd and tolerated himself, without any Disposition to impose his own Sentiments and Practice upon others. I will put the Case, that any Church shou'd make the Opinion of the lawfulness of eating Blood a Term of Admission to it's Communion, a Man that scruples this, cou'd not be able to join in Communion with that Church, how much soever he approv'd it in other Things. But wou'd his not being able to join in Communion with that Church, on such an Account as this, be any Proof that he is not fit to be employ'd by the State? The Apostle plainly determines, that a Man who does a Thing, that his own Conscience disapproves, sins in doing it, and yet he exhorts such Persons not to judge or censure others whose Consciences allow them to do what they scruple. To apply this, 'tis certain, that the Dissenters have scruples about several Things requir'd

quir'd in the Establish'd Church; I am not now inquiring, whether their Scruples be just; if they are in the wrong, they have been sufficient Losers by it, and therefore ought to be pitied, and not reproach'd and insulted; but whilst they are under these Scruples, they are debarr'd from Communion with the Establish'd Church, let them otherwise have never so good an Opinion of that Church, and never so much approve her Articles, as it is known the Generality of the Dissenters do. This being the Case, it will follow indeed that they will (as the Law allows them to do) meet in separate Congregations, where they may enjoy the Benefit of Christian Communion, without being oblig'd to any of those Things which they conscientiously scruple; but it will not follow that they must be oblig'd in Conscience to destroy the Establishment. If they be allow'd the Liberty of worshipping God in their own way, they don't pretend to prescribe to others. And if it be judg'd proper to debar them from Ecclesiastical Benefices and Preferments in the Church, because they cannot comply with the Terms the Church requires, yet why should they be render'd incapable of serving the State to which they are known to be well-affected?

Since this Gentleman and others have thought fit to appeal to *Scotland* in the present Question, the Dissenters desire no more than to be treated with the same Tenderness under an Episcopal Establishment, with which the Episcopal Dissenters are treated in a Country where Presbytery is establish'd. They will not pretend, that because they are known to be by Principle and Inclination strongly attach'd to the present Government, and the others known to be almost universally against it, that therefore they ought to be distinguish'd with superior Advantages, but they hope they shall not be us'd worse than they are.

Those

Those that dissent from the Establishment in *North-Britain* not only have a Toleration given them, but have a Capacity of being admitted to Places of Profit and Trust upon taking the Oaths to the Government, without any other Test impos'd upon them; the Dissenters here once had that Priviledge too, but after the many signal Services they had done their Country and the Protestant Religion, without any Fault that I can find ever laid to their Charge, they have been depriv'd of this Priviledge, by which an odious Distinction is put upon them, so that one that is unacquainted with the History of the Times wou'd be apt to think that they had merited this Brand by some signal Act of Disloyalty. This they cannot but look upon as a great Grievance, and therefore hope they will not be blam'd, if they humbly apply to the Wisdom and Justice of this present Parliament to relieve them from it.

It is hop'd that those that are truly zealous for the Honour of the Church of *England* will be loth that in Moderation and a kind and generous Conduct towards those that dissent from her, she shou'd be out-done by a Presbyterian Church. Indeed the Revd. Mr. *Story* has been very caretul to save the Church's Honour, by telling us, that this is a Thing in which the Church has no concern; it lies wholly before the State, and the Question turns wholly upon political Considerations. And if this be the Case, it is to be hop'd that the Clergy will leave the State to do its own Business, or if they interpose at all, that it will be in a Way of Moderation and Charity, so becoming Christians and the Ministers of Jesus. But whilst the Danger of the Church is almost the only Argument made use of for continuing their Fellow-Protestants under legal Restraints and Incapacities, it will still be regarded as the Church's Cause, and if there be any

C
Thing

Thing wrong in it the Church will be hardly able to escape the Discredit of it, which I hope our Parliament, who I really believe have a sincere Regard for the Honour of the establish'd Church, will endeavour to remove.

Another obvious Reflexion that offers itself on this Occasion is, that whereas the Question has been often put of late what the Presbyterians wou'd do if they had it in their Power, and it has been insinuated that they would not give that Toleration to others which themselves enjoy, here is a Case directly to the Point; a Country where Presbytery is the Establishment, yet not only a Toleration is given to those that dissent from that Establishment, but they have a full Capacity of being admitted to Places of Profit and Trust upon taking the Oaths to the Government. And what renders this more remarkable is, that there had been very severe Tests injoin'd before, when Episcopacy was establish'd in that Country, whereby Presbyterians were disqualified for civil Offices, or for electing Burgesses for Parliament, and for following some Kind of Trades. But the Presbyterians, when it came to their Turn to be in Power after the Revolution, never pretended to impose any Test that should oblige any Person to the peculiar Principles of Presbyterians, as a Qualification for civil Offices.

I think it is also a very natural Reflection on this Subject, that the admitting Dissenters to a Capacity of Places of Profit and Trust, is very consistent with the Security of an establish'd Church. Indeed most of the Pamphlets that have been lately publish'd on this Subject, whether of our own Production or imported from abroad, seem to proceed upon this as a certain Principle, that no establish'd Church can  
be



be safe, where those that dissent from it are capable of Offices of Profit and Trust. But I beg leave to mention the establish'd Church of *North-Britain* as an Instance to the contrary. Those that dissent from that Establishment have no legal Restraints or civil Incapacities laid upon them on the Account of that dissent; yet that Church is in Safety, and who-soever wou'd affirm that it is in Danger under his Majesty's Administration, wou'd be justly regarded as an Incendiary, and a Disturber of the publick Peace and of his Majesty's Government. That Church is by the Union establish'd on a solid Basis; and the Episcopal Establishment in *England* and *Ireland* hath the same Security, and it is put out of the Power either of King or Parliament to alter it without subverting the Constitution. This is a strong Security, common to both Churches, and every way sufficient. But besides this, the establish'd Church in *England* and *Ireland* has additional Securities, which the other has not: His Majesty is of the Church of *England*, and so are all our succeeding Princes oblig'd to be. The Parliament of the united Kingdom of *Great-Britain* has a vast Majority of Members that are of the Episcopal Persuasion; and in the House of Lords the Bishops are a standing Part of the Legislature. The Constitution of the Parliament is the same in *Ireland*; and without some extraordinary Revolution which wou'd intirely unhinge the whole present Settlement, which no Dissenter in his Senses wou'd desire, can never be expected to be otherwise. Now if the establish'd Church in *Scotland* be safe without the Security of a Test (as I believe it is) under a Parliament of Church of *England* men, can any Reason be assign'd why the Church of *England* which has all the Securities that Church has, and far more, shou'd not be safe if the Test were repeal'd? Or wou'd the mere  
 putting



putting a few Dissenters in Places under the Government (which is the utmost that cou'd be suppos'd the Consequence of it) endanger a Church which has the King, the Parliament, the Nobility, and a vast Majority of the Gentry on its Side, besides its being now made an unalterable Part of the Constitution? I must own, this seems to me so extraordinary a Supposition, that I can scarce persuade myself that any Man of Sense can seriously believe it. And in my Opinion, they are far from consulting the Honour of the establish'd Church in *England* and *Ireland*, who represent her as standing in need of so much more Security than other Churches, as if she had not as good a Foundation in Scripture, Reason, or Antiquity, which I am sure is a Supposition that none of her Friends will admit. But besides, why shou'd not the Church in *Ireland* be as safe supposing the Test-Act were repeal'd as she was before it was made? What shou'd hinder the Church's being as secure now as it was before 1703? Or let any Man name the Disadvantages and Dangers that accrued to Church and State from admitting the Dissenters to Places of Profit and Trust in the Reign of King *William*, of glorious Memory, tho' he was suppos'd to be one that by his Education might be dispos'd to favour them? it were easy to enlarge on this Argument, but I believe you will be of Opinion that this may be sufficient. Groundless Clamours about the Church's Danger may do very well with the Populace, but it were an Affront to the Legislature to suppose them capable of being influenc'd by a Pretence which has so little Appearance of Reason to support it. *I am,*



S I R,

Your affectionate humble Servant.

